

March 15, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H2769

ferent from its predecessor generation. The vast majority of the academically interested young people have no similarity to their pre-litler counterparts. Today's university and Gymnasia students are fundamentally 'anti-nationalistic, anti-militaristic, non-conformists, pro-Israel and philo-Semitic'. Many are open and unprejudiced, resentful of their parents' generation. They are informed about the Third Reich. The mass media, radio, television, newspapers, books and educational materials bring the holocaust before them every week of the year. One might wish that our own Jewish youngsters knew as much about Fascism and Nazism as German youth seems to know. They are prepared to accept the responsibility of history. They realize that as members of the nation, they cannot divorce themselves from its past, but they refuse to be afflicted with guilt feelings. They are unwilling to bear the burden of collective guilt for what their parents and grandparents did. As one young person said to us: 'For the older generation the Third Reich is a moral matter. For us, it is a historical one from which we are prepared to learn but for which we refuse to bear personal guilt.'"

So far the report of the four rabbis and I have nothing to add to it.

Let me come to a conclusion now:

The answer to the question Rabbi Gerstenfeld has put to me: Is Germany going Nazi again? is No, as I said before, I believe that I have given you some insights into the German situation which perhaps cannot serve as legal evidence that my No is correct, but which might help you to see that my answer may be right.

Through Nazism we Germans have learned that eternal vigilance is the price of freedom. I assure you we will be most vigilant!

#### INDUSTRY'S INTEREST IN MODEL CITIES

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. BRASCO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, today the President has sent to us his message with his recommendations for continuing the war on poverty. Let me add my voice to those who have expressed their support for this message.

I am especially attracted to the hard commonsense possibilities which it expresses and to the very real avenues of private participation which it develops, participation which I believe is mandatory to the success of our efforts to eliminate urban poverty.

The model cities program proposal of areawide action is very sensible when measured against efforts which would merely continue to nibble at the physical fringes of urban problems.

There should be no question in any of our minds, by now, that we are not going to mend our cities with finger-in-the-dike approaches. The logic of the one and the illogic of the other is obvious.

Of the challenges and opportunities which this program presents one of the most significant is the demand created for a new technology, for the development of an entirely new industry, new materials, new techniques for using those materials, and for relating labor use in new and rehabilitation construction so that seasonal layoffs are compensated for and annual contracts become realistic objectives.

The sheer size of the model cities program commands the attention of the construction and building materials industries of the Nation. This new market is billion-dollar size. It will exercise demand over many years beyond the present emergency, a demand which must be supplied. That, Mr. Speaker, is a basic commitment of our American economy.

Industry's interest is already explicit in some areas. Experimental programs by U.S. Gypsum, U.S. Plywood, Armstrong Cork, and others have already developed new technology and have pointed in new directions. These industries are now concerning themselves with developing cost control techniques.

Industry's interest is also implicit in other areas. It is, for example, concerned with the possibilities of contracting and of subcontracting the work of rehabilitation to the people living in model cities areas. Such action would bring a new and needed viability to the residents living in these areas.

This is the most vitally important ingredient of the program. In sum, private industry and the people themselves become the two parts of the machinery for getting the job done. This is not new. This is the partnership that built America—railroads, miners, airlines, homesteaders. There is no reason not to continue in this same fine tradition.

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. BRASCO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MULTER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### CIA DEFENDERS SUPPORT METHODS OF COMMUNISTS

(Mr. MOSS (at the request of Mr. BRASCO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following editorial to my colleagues. Our great strength is our society's differences in method—let us not dilute our freedoms by emulating the systems we have so long opposed. If public support is required, let us unashamedly publicly give it.

The editorial follows:

[From the Sacramento Bee, Mar. 7, 1967]  
CIA DEFENDERS SUPPORT METHODS OF COMMUNISTS

Almost as dismal as the hitherto secret subsidizing of the National Student Association and other groups by the Central Intelligence Agency is the fatuous efforts of some to justify this policy.

No one contends that making propaganda front runners of students will destroy the independence of American education, although it has done it no good.

The revelation of the CIA's covert operations, however, has led to a loss of confidence, at least, for the moment in the avowed purposes of many groups. At a time when lack of confidence is identified as the "credibility gap" this further exposure of crypto enterprises simply widens the gap and calls for a burdensome house cleaning.

Apologists for the CIA point out that

Russia uses students to spread the gospel according to St. Marx. It is a self-defeating defense. It is not a question of what America wants its image to be before the world; it is a question of what this nation wants its image to be before itself.

The fact Russia does it once would have been the best reason for the United States not to do it. The US is proud of the content of its propaganda as the supporter of freedom. This propaganda could have been openly acclaimed and been more effective.

Moreover, the CIA's subsidies were bound to be exposed sooner or later with a backlash that would make the world suspect Americans always talk with "forked tongues". As couriers of information amateurs are out of their field. No one should know this better than the CIA.

Those who defend the hidden use of students and other amateurs must find it difficult to explain the instant revulsion of the public and press. If the CIA's subsidizing activities are as proper as the defenders say, why did the NSA immediately announce it was rejecting further subventions? Why did the American Newspaper Guild immediately disclaim knowledge that \$1 million dollars of its funds had come from the CIA.

Let the apologists cry that the CIA was right in subverting so much of American life, but let them take note that all the amateur spies are coming in out of the cold in droves.

(Mr. MOSS (at the request of Mr. BRASCO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MOSS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### TAX RELIEF FOR THE FORGOTTEN AMERICAN—THE MIDDLE INCOME FAMILY

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. BRASCO) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing six bills to correct the glaring inequities in our Federal income tax law.

The first measure—H.R. 7240—would increase the exemption for certain dependents from the present \$600 to a fairer and more realistic \$1,200. This new increase would apply to dependent children under 16 and students under 22; to mentally or physically incapacitated dependents and to dependents over the age of 65.

The second measure—H.R. 7295—would correct a serious inequity that hurts working mothers and single heads of households, such as widows and widowers, who must provide adequate care and supervision for dependent children while they work. It provides that these taxpayers may deduct the full cost of child care up to \$1,200 for one child and a total of \$3,600 for three or more children in any tax year, when the care is necessary to free the taxpayer to earn a living.

The third measure—H.R. 7297—I am introducing would alleviate the inequitable tax burden on single persons by permitting them to utilize the more liberal head of household method of computing their taxes.